

Interview Summary	Application No. 09/820,966	Applicant(s) BROUK ET AL.	
	Examiner Dung Dinh	Art Unit 2152	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) Dung Dinh. (3) Fredrik Mollbron.
 (2) Chad Zhong. (4) ____.

Date of Interview: 03 August 2005.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
 c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
 If Yes, brief description: ____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1.

Identification of prior art discussed: Cookmeyer.


Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Discusses distinction between invention and the reference. The invention is directed at application level message processing whereas reference is directed at low level, frame processing. The examiner will reconsider after the claims are amended to clearly point out this feature.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Dung C. Dinh
 Primary Examiner


 Examiner's signature, if required

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.